

Theorem (Model construction): Let N be a set of clauses that is saturated up to redundancy and does not contain the empty clause. Then we have for every ground clause $C\theta \in \bar{N}$:

- (i) $E_{C\theta} = \emptyset$ if and only if $C\theta$ is true in $R_{C\theta}$.
- (ii) $C\theta$ is true in R_∞ and in R_D for every $D >_C C\theta$.

Proof: We use induction on the clause ordering $>_C$ and assume that (i) and (ii) are already satisfied for all clauses in \bar{N} that are smaller than $C\theta$. Note that the “if” part of (i) is obvious from the model construction and that condition (ii) follows immediately from (i) and the two corollaries above. So it remains to show the “only if” part of (i).

Case 1: $x\theta$ is reducible by $R_{C\theta}$.

Suppose there is a variable x occurring in C such that $x\theta$ is reducible by $R_{C\theta}$, say $x\theta \rightarrow_{R_{C\theta}} w$. Let the substitution θ' be defined by $x\theta' = w$ and $y\theta' = y\theta$ for every variable $y \neq x$. The clause $C\theta'$ is smaller than $C\theta$. By part (ii) of the induction hypothesis, it is true in $R_{C\theta}$. By congruence, every literal of $C\theta$ is true in $R_{C\theta}$ if and only if the corresponding literal of $C\theta'$ is true in $R_{C\theta}$; hence $C\theta$ is true in $R_{C\theta}$.

Case 2: $C\theta$ contains a maximal negative literal.

Suppose that $C\theta$ does not fall into Case 1 and that $C\theta = C'\theta \vee s\theta \not\approx s'\theta$, where $s\theta \not\approx s'\theta$ is maximal in $C\theta$. If $s\theta \approx s'\theta$ is false in $R_{C\theta}$, then $C\theta$ is clearly true in $R_{C\theta}$ and we are done. So assume that $s\theta \approx s'\theta$ is true in $R_{C\theta}$, that is, $s\theta \downarrow_{R_{C\theta}} s'\theta$. Without loss of generality, $s\theta \geq s'\theta$.

Case 2.1: $s\theta = s'\theta$.

If $s\theta = s'\theta$, then there is an *equality resolution* inference

$$\frac{C'\theta \vee s\theta \not\approx s'\theta}{C'\theta}.$$

As shown in the Lifting Lemma, this is an instance of an *equality resolution* inference from C . By saturation up to redundancy, it is redundant, hence its conclusion follows from clauses in \bar{N} that are smaller than $C\theta$. By the induction hypothesis, these clauses are true in $R_{C\theta}$. Thus $C'\theta$ and $C\theta$ are true in $R_{C\theta}$.

Case 2.2: $s\theta > s'\theta$.

If $s\theta \downarrow_{R_{C\theta}} s'\theta$ and $s\theta > s'\theta$, then $s\theta$ must be reducible by some rule in some $E_{D\theta} \subseteq R_{C\theta}$. (Without loss of generality we assume that C and D are variable disjoint; so we can use the same substitution θ .) Let $D\theta = D'\theta \vee t\theta \approx t'\theta$ with $E_{D\theta} = \{t\theta \rightarrow t'\theta\}$. Since $D\theta$ is productive, $D'\theta$ is false in $R_{C\theta}$.

Note that $t\theta$ cannot occur in $s\theta$ at or below a variable position of s , say $x\theta = w[t\theta]$, since otherwise $C\theta$ would be subject to Case 1 above. Consequently, the *left superposition* inference

$$\frac{D'\theta \vee t\theta \approx t'\theta \quad C'\theta \vee s\theta[t\theta] \not\approx s'\theta}{D'\theta \vee C'\theta \vee s\theta[t'\theta] \not\approx s'\theta}$$

is a ground instance of a *left superposition* inference from D and C . By saturation up to redundancy, its conclusion follows from clauses in \bar{N} that are smaller than $C\theta$. By the induction hypothesis, these clauses are true in $R_{C\theta}$, thus $D'\theta \vee C'\theta \vee s\theta[t'\theta] \not\approx s'\theta$ is true in $R_{C\theta}$. Since $D'\theta$ and $s\theta[t'\theta] \not\approx s'\theta$ are false in $R_{C\theta}$, both $C'\theta$ and $C\theta$ must be true.

Case 3: $C\theta$ does not contain a maximal negative literal.

Suppose that $C\theta$ does not fall into Cases 1 or 2. Then $C\theta$ can be written as $C'\theta \vee s\theta \approx s'\theta$, where $s\theta \approx s'\theta$ is a maximal literal of $C\theta$. If $E_{C\theta} = \{s\theta \rightarrow s'\theta\}$ or $C'\theta$ is true in $R_{C\theta}$ or $s\theta = s'\theta$, then there is nothing to show, so assume that $E_{C\theta} = \emptyset$ and that $C'\theta$ is false in $R_{C\theta}$. Without loss of generality, $s\theta > s'\theta$.

Case 3.1: $s\theta \approx s'\theta$ is maximal in $C\theta$, but not strictly maximal.

If $s\theta \approx s'\theta$ is maximal in $C\theta$, but not strictly maximal, then $C\theta$ can be written as $C''\theta \vee t\theta \approx t'\theta \vee s\theta \approx s'\theta$, where $t\theta = s\theta$ and $t'\theta = s'\theta$. In this case, there is a *equality factoring* inference

$$\frac{C''\theta \vee t\theta \approx t'\theta \vee s\theta \approx s'\theta}{C''\theta \vee t'\theta \not\approx s'\theta \vee t\theta \approx t'\theta}$$

This inference is a ground instance of an inference from C . By saturation, its conclusion is true in $R_{C\theta}$. Trivially, $t'\theta = s'\theta$ implies $t'\theta \downarrow_{R_{C\theta}} s'\theta$, so $t'\theta \not\approx s'\theta$ must be false and $C\theta$ must be true in $R_{C\theta}$.

Case 3.2: $s\theta \approx s'\theta$ is strictly maximal in $C\theta$ and $s\theta$ is reducible.

Suppose that $s\theta \approx s'\theta$ is strictly maximal in $C\theta$ and $s\theta$ is reducible by some rule in $E_{D\theta} \subseteq R_{C\theta}$. Let $D\theta = D'\theta \vee t\theta \approx t'\theta$ and $E_{D\theta} = \{t\theta \rightarrow t'\theta\}$. Since

$D\theta$ is productive, $D'\theta$ is false in $R_{C\theta}$. We can now proceed in essentially the same way as in Case 2.2: If $t\theta$ occurred in $s\theta$ at or below a variable position of s , say $x\theta = w[t\theta]$, then $C\theta$ would be subject to Case 1 above. Otherwise, the *right superposition* inference

$$\frac{D'\theta \vee t\theta \approx t'\theta \quad C'\theta \vee s\theta[t\theta] \approx s'\theta}{D'\theta \vee C'\theta \vee s\theta[t'\theta] \approx s'\theta}$$

is a ground instance of a *right superposition* inference from D and C . By saturation up to redundancy, its conclusion is true in $R_{C\theta}$. Since $D'\theta$ and $C'\theta$ are false in $R_{C\theta}$, $s\theta[t'\theta] \approx s'\theta$ must be true in $R_{C\theta}$. On the other hand, $t\theta \approx t'\theta$ is true in $R_{C\theta}$, so by congruence, $s\theta[t\theta] \approx s'\theta$ and $C\theta$ are true in $R_{C\theta}$.

Case 3.3: $s\theta \approx s'\theta$ is strictly maximal in $C\theta$ and $s\theta$ is irreducible.

Suppose that $s\theta \approx s'\theta$ is strictly maximal in $C\theta$ and $s\theta$ is irreducible by $R_{C\theta}$. Then there are three possibilities: $C\theta$ can be true in $R_{C\theta}$, or $C'\theta$ can be true in $R_{C\theta} \cup \{s\theta \rightarrow s'\theta\}$, or $E_{C\theta} = \{s\theta \rightarrow s'\theta\}$. In the first and the third case, there is nothing to show. Let us therefore assume that $C\theta$ is false in $R_{C\theta}$ and $C'\theta$ is true in $R_{C\theta} \cup \{s\theta \rightarrow s'\theta\}$. Then $C'\theta = C''\theta \vee t\theta \approx t'\theta$, where the literal $t\theta \approx t'\theta$ is true in $R_{C\theta} \cup \{s\theta \rightarrow s'\theta\}$ and false in $R_{C\theta}$. In other words, $t\theta \downarrow_{R_{C\theta} \cup \{s\theta \rightarrow s'\theta\}} t'\theta$, but not $t\theta \downarrow_{R_{C\theta}} t'\theta$. Consequently, there is a rewrite proof of $t\theta \rightarrow^* u \leftarrow^* t'\theta$ by $R_{C\theta} \cup \{s\theta \rightarrow s'\theta\}$ in which the rule $s\theta \rightarrow s'\theta$ is used at least once. Without loss of generality we assume that $t\theta \geq t'\theta$. Since $s\theta \approx s'\theta >_L t\theta \approx t'\theta$ and $s\theta > s'\theta$ we can conclude that $s\theta \geq t\theta > t'\theta$. But then there is only one possibility how the rule $s\theta \rightarrow s'\theta$ can be used in the rewrite proof: We must have $s\theta = t\theta$ and the rewrite proof must have the form $t\theta \rightarrow s'\theta \rightarrow^* u \leftarrow^* t'\theta$, where the first step uses $s\theta \rightarrow s'\theta$ and all other steps use rules from $R_{C\theta}$. Consequently, $s'\theta \approx t'\theta$ is true in $R_{C\theta}$. Now observe that there is an *equality factoring* inference

$$\frac{C''\theta \vee t\theta \approx t'\theta \vee s\theta \approx s'\theta}{C''\theta \vee t'\theta \not\approx s'\theta \vee t\theta \approx t'\theta}$$

whose conclusion is true in $R_{C\theta}$ by saturation. Since the literal $t'\theta \not\approx s'\theta$ must be false in $R_{C\theta}$, the rest of the clause must be true in $R_{C\theta}$, and therefore $C\theta$ must be true in $R_{C\theta}$, contradicting our assumption. This concludes the proof of the theorem.